

1. Introduction

Proactive and effective public involvement is a cornerstone of planning practice, and focused public engagement is crucial to achieve success in land use and transportation planning initiatives that often impact the entire community. Hillsboro residents have consistently expressed an expectation that the City prioritize public engagement to maintain transparency and encourage participation through feedback in the Hillsboro 2020 and 2035 projects, including providing avenues for meaningful public involvement, access to information, and opportunities for collaboration, with transparent and inclusive public engagement practices. Public involvement is the first of Oregon's Statewide Planning Goals, and a number of laws and regulations at the federal and state level compel local governments to conduct public involvement efforts.



Bolstering
Community
Involvement

This Public involvement background report is one of a series of papers identifying recommended policy questions and updates to the Hillsboro Comprehensive Plan. The intent of this report is to examine the City's public involvement efforts as they relate to land use and transportation planning, and evaluate these efforts against relevant policies, goals, and regulations as well as emerging issues and trends. The outcome of this report is a series of policy questions and recommendations to inform the update of the Bolstering Community Involvement section of the City's new Comprehensive Plan. This background report was prepared by City of Hillsboro Planning staff, and will be refined and reviewed through a process including a Citizen Advisory Committee, the Planning Commission and City Council.

Historically, public involvement has been referred to as "Citizen Involvement" in statewide planning regulations, the Hillsboro Comprehensive Plan, and even in earlier versions of this background report. Going forward, staff feels that the term "Public Involvement" better reflects the intent of broad participation and representation in public processes. Where "Citizen Involvement" is used here, it generally refers either to specific documents or bodies already in place, but the term "public involvement" will be utilized to reflect the efforts to be implemented into the future.

2. Background

The Hillsboro Planning Department conducts a number of public involvement activities including:

- Public notification of land use applications,
- Meetings and events for various planning projects,
- Providing public information available at the counter and online, and
- Conducting research and producing reports to understand how the City is growing and how to involve the public in guiding that growth.

Public involvement is addressed in Section 1 of the existing Comprehensive Plan, including goals, oversight structures, and policies related to public records availability, communication, public feedback,

and public involvement-related budget needs. All of these activities are guided by Statewide Planning Goal 1, discussed in further detail later in this report.

Many land use applications require some level of public involvement, ranging from mailed public notices to open houses or other forums for informal discussion and input from residents, as required by procedures outlined in the Comprehensive Plan and Community Development Code (which, in turn, implement state statute and administrative rules). Some required community meetings are coordinated by the applicant, rather than the City, with the applicant submitting documentation that requirements were met. In 2014, approximately 130 applications were filed that required some level of public notice.

The department also conducts various long-term planning and transportation projects such as the South Hillsboro master planning project, overhaul and maintenance of the Community Development Code, and strategic initiatives such as the Comprehensive Plan Update project. Most of these projects have employed some sort of Web site for publicity, along with stakeholder or focus groups, and open houses to solicit input from the public. Most also result in work sessions and public hearings at Planning Commission and/or City Council. Some projects have used additional outreach and public involvement methods such as surveys, design charrettes, outreach at public events, newsletters, public tours, or other methods.

2.1. Planning Commission and Planning and Zoning Hearings Board

There are two governing bodies overseeing planning decision-making in the City: the Planning Commission, and the Planning and Zoning Hearings Board, as defined in the Hillsboro Municipal Code.

The Planning Commission is a seven-member body appointed by the City Council, to advise on land use issues and priorities, make quasi-judicial land use decisions,¹ and make legislative recommendations. The Commission is also charged with reviewing and approving public participation measures, including public involvement plans for individual planning projects. No more than two members may be engaged in the same occupation or profession. As discussed in more detail below, all members of the Planning Commission also serve on the Citizen Involvement Advisory Committee.²

The Planning and Zoning Hearings Board (PZHB) conducts public hearings for certain land use applications, such as conditional use permits and variances. Board membership includes three hearings officers, who must be accredited law school graduates, and six lay members. Although the scope of PZHB does not itself involve public involvement oversight, two PZHB members currently serve on the Advisory Committee for Citizen Involvement.³

2.2. Citizen Involvement Advisory Committee (CIAC) and Advisory Committee for Citizen Involvement (ACCI)

Goal 1 requires cities to establish a public involvement committee responsible for oversight and evaluation of the city's public involvement efforts related to land use planning. The Citizen Involvement

¹ A quasi-judicial land use decision (as defined by Community Development Code section 12.70.050) is made by an elected or appointed Review Authority, and requires substantial exercise of discretion and judgment in applying approval criteria. Type III procedures defined in the City's Community Development Code are quasi-judicial; these include most adjustments, conditional uses, non-conforming use expansions, planned unit developments, subdivisions, variances, and zone changes, among other application types.

² See Hillsboro Municipal Code Subchapter 2.40.

³ See Hillsboro Municipal Code Subchapter 2.44.

Advisory Committee (CIAC) was established in the 1977 Comprehensive Plan as “a group of citizens selected by the City Council to conduct the Citizen Involvement Program”.⁴ Initially, the members of the Planning Commission served as the members of CIAC, with additional members appointed at the discretion of the City Council.

In 1996, Section 1 of the Comprehensive Plan was overhauled as part of the City’s Periodic Review Work Program to bring the public involvement program into compliance with Statewide Planning Goal 1. These revisions included restructuring the CIAC into 18-member panel with broad geographic representation throughout the City based on designated sub-areas. This structure proved difficult to maintain both due to the size of the committee, as well as the sporadic nature of the committee’s work (coinciding mostly with the initiation of major planning projects).

In 2011, the CIAC was once again restructured and returned to its original (and present) structure with the Planning Commissioners serving as CIAC members.⁵ This restructuring also required the creation of a separate, smaller advisory committee providing input to the CIAC, currently called the Advisory Committee for Citizen Involvement (ACCI, originally named the Public Process Advisory Committee and subsequently renamed as a result of public input).⁶ The statewide Citizen Involvement Advisory Committee (which reviews all changes to Goal 1-related Comprehensive Plan policies) supported the restructuring, but requested language to ensure that members would be broadly representative of the Hillsboro community. This feedback is reflected in the current structure of the ACCI:

- One liaison each from the Planning Commission and Vision Implementation Committee,
- One representative from each City Council ward, and
- Up to four additional members “representative of a broad spectrum of the community selected from an open nomination process”.⁷

As currently structured, ACCI reviews Public Involvement Plans developed by staff for proposed plan revisions, major plan amendments, or upon request of the City Council or CIAC. ACCI gives feedback to staff to refine these Public Involvement Plans, and ultimately provides a recommendation to CIAC for approval, revision, or denial of proposed Public Involvement Plans. Originally, ACCI was conceptualized as a committee that could conduct more holistic reviews of communications techniques and methods across the Planning Department (and potentially for other City departments), but the committee has not been engaged in this capacity thus far.

Despite the changes made in the 2011 restructuring, ACCI membership and engagement has remained sporadic and inconsistent. In an attempt to address ongoing vacancies on the board, the City Council approved a recommendation from Planning staff to add two representatives from the Planning and Zoning Hearings Board to ACCI. As of October 2015, ACCI has five active members, including appointments made in summer 2015 to include representatives of the Vision Implementation Committee and the Youth Advisory Council. All current members of ACCI are engaged with other City governing bodies or advisory committees.

⁴ Section I(II)(A), Hillsboro Comprehensive Plan, adopted in Ordinance No. 2793-4-77.

⁵ Case File Hillsboro Comprehensive Plan 6-09, adopted as Ordinance No. 5987.

⁶ Ordinance No. 6009.

⁷ Hillsboro Comprehensive Plan Section 1(II)(E)(iv).

To date, ACCI involvement has been typically limited to reviewing proposed public involvement plans for discrete planning projects such as community plans or amendments to the Community Development Code. Staff could find no record of an ACCI review of the department's overall communications efforts.

3. Hillsboro 2020 and Hillsboro 2035

For nearly 20 years, the Hillsboro Vision and Action Committee has been one of the key driving forces behind citywide civic engagement in Hillsboro. After experiencing significant economic and residential growth beginning in the 1960s and 1970s, the community became economically self-sufficient with a strong and diverse industrial base and vital retail areas. The City also began to experience the associated challenges with growth as it more than doubled in physical size and tripled in population. As a result, the City began to face questions about how the community's character and identity would adapt.

The City began its visioning project, called Hillsboro 2020, in 1997. The Hillsboro Vision and Action Committee reached out to more than 1,500 people to create a common vision for the City, along with strategies and actions to implement this vision. The resulting Vision Action Plan was adopted by City Council in 2000, and subsequently updated in 2005 and 2010. Vision 2020 was named a project of the year by the International Association for Public Participation in 2002.

Beginning in 2013, the City began a project to develop its next community vision, the Hillsboro 2035 Community Plan, building on the success of the original visioning project. The Plan is scheduled for release in late 2015.

3.1. Vision 2020

The 2020 Vision and Action Plan⁸ was organized into a series of focus areas, strategies, and actions. The actions most related to public involvement are listed below, with a brief note on the implementation status of each action.

Action & Summary	Status
1.1 <i>Citizen Involvement Advisory Committee:</i> Implement CIAC consistent with Section 1 of the Hillsboro Comprehensive Plan.	Implemented, although some challenges remain (see section 2.2).
1.2 <i>Promote Participation in Local Decisions:</i> Develop dialogue between the City, citizens, and stakeholders to promote regular participation in local decisions and encourage volunteerism.	Implemented and ongoing
1.3 <i>Building Community:</i> Facilitate opportunities to build community at the neighborhood level and improve dialogue on local issues.	Implemented and ongoing
1.4 <i>City-Neighborhood Communications:</i> Facilitate direct communication with neighborhoods and districts on critical issues through HOAs or multifamily housing contacts.	Implementation anticipated in 2016-2020 timeframe.

⁸ *Hillsboro 2020 Vision and Action Plan*, Revised August 2010
(http://www.hillsboro2020.org/FileLib/H2020ActionPlan2010_Web.pdf).

Action & Summary	Status
2.2 <i>Access to the Web</i> : Promote, encourage, and develop online access to the City and other local government resources.	Implemented and enhanced most recently in 2013 with the launch of a new City Web site supporting mobile device access.
8.2 <i>Student Involvement in Government</i> : Develop avenues for high school/college student involvement in local government.	Implemented via the Mayor's Youth Advisory Council, discussed in section 7.2
13.2 <i>Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee</i> : Establish an advisory committee for active transportation investments.	Previously implemented but not currently active. This group, or a new group in a similar role, will be formed as part of the Transportation System Update project.
15.1 <i>Hillsboro Historic Landmarks Advisory Committee</i> : Establish an advisory committee on historic landmarks	Implemented and currently active, coordinated by Planning Department staff.

3.2. Hillsboro 2035

The Hillsboro 2035 Community Plan includes a broad focus area dedicated to Education and Community Involvement, including initiatives related to educational programs, workforce training, community events, and civic engagement. Of the initiatives and actions in this section, three are most relevant to land use planning and decision-making (each targeted for implementation by the City by 2020):

- Initiative 4A: Develop a cultural inclusion strategy and expand engagement to minority populations.
- Initiative 5A: Develop and promote volunteer opportunities to include diverse community members.
- Initiative 5B: Expand youth engagement in community affairs and government.

4. Existing Comprehensive Plan Goals

From the beginning, the City's comprehensive planning efforts have included significant public involvement in plan development and adoption. The original Hillsboro Comprehensive Plan was adopted in 1977,⁹ although public involvement in planning and development dates back to the early 1970s when the City began its initial planning work.

Section 1 was significantly revised in 1996¹⁰ to modernize Plan language to comply with Oregon Statewide Planning Goal 1, as part of the City's Periodic Review program. Section 1 currently includes four goals related to public involvement:

- A. Design, and implement citizen involvement programs, which facilitates public involvement in major Comprehensive Plan and implementing land use ordinance revisions and assures that such actions are based on factual and complete available information. At a minimum, such public involvement programs will provide for adequate notice on citizen involvement activities; advanced information on matters under consideration; and opportunities for citizen involvement as determined by the CIAC.

⁹ Ordinance No. 2793-4-77

¹⁰ Case File Hillsboro Comprehensive Plan 8-96, adopted as Ordinance No. 4491.

- B. Inform the citizens of the Hillsboro planning area of the opportunity to participate in all phases of planning through the citizen involvement program.
- C. Encourage and actively solicit citizen participation through a diverse and wide-ranging communication program.
- D. Develop, through education, a citizenry capable of effective participation in the planning process.

A fifth goal was deleted in 2011 in conjunction with the CIAC/ACCI restructuring discussed in Section 2.2. This goal stated:

Establish a City Citizen Involvement Program to be conducted by the CIAC that provides individual public involvement programs for plan revisions and major plan amendments to the Comprehensive Plan that are consistent with State Planning Goal 1 and the financial resources of the City. At a minimum, such a public involvement program will provide for adequate notice on citizen involvement activities; advanced information on matters under consideration; and opportunities for citizen participation as determined by the CIAC.

Section 1 includes one map, Figure 1-1, designating eight planning subareas that were formerly used as the basis for CIAC representation. The language in the 2011 update removed all reference to this figure, but the map itself remains in the document. Figure 1-1 should be updated and referenced, or removed. Section 1 also includes public notice, hearings, and other notification requirements related to major and minor plan amendments that are more procedural in nature. Although these topics involve public notice and communication, they should be relocated to the Land Use Procedures section of the comprehensive plan.

5. Regulatory Context

5.1. Federal Regulations

Public involvement in local land use processes is not explicitly regulated at the federal level, although the City should be prepared to address specific requirements in cases where they are applicable (often due to federal funding being used for a particular project).

5.1.1. Civil Rights Act of 1964

Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 prohibits discrimination based on race, color, religion, sex, or national origin in all government programs and activities receiving federal financial assistance. Two federal Executive Orders reinforce Title VI by requiring recipients of federal funding to address potential discrimination and barriers to broad public participation:

- Executive Order 12898 requires compliance with federal agency environmental justice programs, ensuring that diverse population groups are included in data collection, public participation, and decision making processes.
- Executive Order 13166 requires that reasonable steps be taken to ensure meaningful access to programs and activities by limited English-proficient speakers.

5.1.2. Americans with Disabilities Act

Title II of the Americans with Disabilities Act requires local governments to ensure equal access for individuals with disabilities in all programs, services, and activities, regardless of whether those programs receive federal assistance. Title II includes regulations addressing communications and meeting venues, among other topics.

5.1.3. Age Discrimination Act of 1975

The Age Discrimination Act of 1975 prohibits discrimination on the basis of age in any program or activity receiving federal financial assistance.

5.1.4. Other federal acts

Other individual federal acts (for example, federal transportation or environmental protection legislation) may include more specific public involvement requirements, often including broad identification of interested parties, public outreach plans and programs, public meetings and events, mechanisms for comment, advisory panels, and public access to documents and technical information.

5.2. Statewide Regulations

5.2.1. Statewide Planning Goals

Oregon Statewide Planning Goal 1 addresses Citizen Involvement.¹¹ Municipalities are required to employ an involvement program to ensure the opportunity for the public to have meaningful involvement throughout the land use planning process. Goal 1 requires municipalities to incorporate six key components in their public involvement program:

- Citizen Involvement: An officially-recognized committee for public involvement broadly representative of geographic areas and interests related to land use and land-use decisions to provide for widespread public involvement;
- Communication: Mechanisms for effective two-way communication between the public and elected/appointed officials;
- Influence: Opportunities for the public to be involved in all phases of the planning and decision-making process;
- Technical Information: Access to technical information used in the decision-making process, provided in an accessible and understandable format;
- Feedback Mechanisms: Programs to ensure that members of the public receive responses from policy-makers and that a written record for land-use decisions is created and made accessible; and,
- Financial Support: Adequate resources allocated for the public involvement program as an integral component of the planning budget.

In addition to these requirements, Goal 1 also provides a number of guidelines that can be used to shape and enhance a public involvement program, including:

- Developing a comprehensive communications strategy including a variety of media;

¹¹ Oregon Administrative Rule 660-015-0000(1).

- Involving local educational institutions and land-use-related partner agencies to develop strategies for educating local residents on land use and land use decision processes;
- Developing strategies to include local residents in data collection, plan preparation, formal decision making, implementation, evaluation, and revision phases of planning projects;
- Provision of comprehensive technical information including a variety of data sources and types, including both maps and photos; and,
- Clearly identifying how public feedback will be received and considered in planning processes, and reporting out what feedback was received and how it was used.

5.2.2. Statewide Public Meetings & Records Laws

The Planning Commission, CIAC and ACCI are considered public bodies; as such, meetings must comply with Oregon Public Meetings Law.¹² Public meetings must be held in a place accessible to persons with disabilities, and the City must provide reasonable accommodations for those with communications challenges. Records of these meetings, in addition to established records kept in land use decision-making processes, must be retained and made available to the public in compliance with Oregon Public Records Law.¹³

5.3. Metro Regulations

Metro implements its own public involvement program apart and separate from city or county public involvement programs required under Goal 1. Metro codes guide public involvement programs for the regional government itself, and do not generally place additional requirements on member municipalities. Metro ordinances have set guiding principles for public involvement¹⁴ and actions to ensure diversity and equity in its community engagement activities.¹⁵ Although compliance with these ordinances is not explicitly required, these principles and objectives should be considered when setting City goals for public engagement.

6. Other Plans, Programs, or Reports

6.1. City of Hillsboro Mission, Core Values, and Strategic Plan

In 2007, the City began a strategic planning process intended to “enhance delivery of City services in the context of our current and future community needs”.¹⁶ This process yielded goals, strategies, and actions to focus the City’s work toward meeting its mission and core values; those most relevant to public involvement are included in the table below. Although the Planning Department is not necessarily responsible for the implementation of all of these measures, this information illustrates the City’s aspirations for public involvement in general.

Goal	Strategy	Action
2. Anticipate and prepare for change and its potential	2.1. Forecasting	2.1d. Develop an education and communication program to inform employees and the public about trends and future needs, including a yearly economic and demographic “trends briefing”

¹² Oregon Revised Statutes 192.610 to 192.690.

¹³ Oregon Revised Statutes 192.420 to 192.505.

¹⁴ Metro Ordinance 97-2433.

¹⁵ Core Area 3, Metro Diversity Action Plan, adopted as Metro Ordinance 12-4375.

¹⁶ City of Hillsboro Strategic Plan (January 2010).

opportunities and challenges		
4. Nurture a culture of trust and engagement with all Hillsboro residents and community partners	4.4 Public Engagement and Outreach	4.4a. Develop and implement departmental outreach plans that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Engage inter-jurisdictional stakeholders, business community, individuals and other partners Engage non-traditional or underrepresented communities, including different cultures, socioeconomic groups, age groups, individuals and new residents
		4.4b. Develop print, web and other media materials that educate the community about opportunities to volunteer or participate in city programs
5. Ensure City services are responsive, equitable, and accessible	5.1. Inclusive Services	5.1a. Assess city services to identify barriers (language, cultural, socio-economic or physical). Develop and implement solutions to those barriers.
	5.4. Education, Communication, and Transparency	5.4a. Develop public information materials that communicate departmental objectives and define and explain city services.

The Strategic Plan also set specific performance measures to evaluate progress toward meeting goals and aligning with the mission and core values. These performance measures identified outcomes, potential indicators, and data gathering methods to measure progress toward meeting goals. Performance metrics for Goals 4 and 5 were most relevant to public involvement, summarized in the table below:

Desired Outcomes	Potential Indicators	Data Gathering
<i>Goal 4: Nurture a culture of trust and engagement with all Hillsboro residents and community partners</i>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Public and Partners are actively included in decision-making. A wide range of engagement methods is employed. Processes are clearly defined and communicated Outreach efforts maximize opportunities for participation Ongoing education/outreach is conducted outside of specific projects Adequate time included in projects to be collected Public informed about how they influenced decisions Public is satisfied that they have been heard. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increase in public satisfaction with outreach opportunities Attendance at community meetings Number of respondents to surveys and online questionnaires 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Polling Attendance Counts Respondent Counts Evaluation analysis Interviews

<i>Goal 5: Ensure city services are responsive, equitable and accessible</i>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Access to services is open to all • All members of the community have clear access to information • Specific groups are not given inappropriate priority • Services are continuously evaluated and improved to reflect the needs of the community 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increased public satisfaction • Increased participation • Number of bilingual staff 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Public polling • Attendance counts

6.2. Related City Advisory Committees

A handful of advisory committees beyond those mentioned earlier also provide avenues for public engagement in planning programs:

- **Mayor’s Youth Advisory Council:** A group of 20-25 high school students whose mission in part includes providing review and comment to elected officials and City decision-makers regarding issues that have an impact on youth. YAC is administered by the Human Resources Department.
- **Historic Landmarks Advisory Committee:** A seven-member committee whose mission includes general public outreach and specific assistance to owners of historic properties in the City. HLAC is administered by the Planning Department.
- **Transportation Committee:** A four-member committee comprised of three City Councilors and a non-voting public advisor to advise on transportation and traffic system issues, plans, and programs. Transportation Committee is administered by the Public Works Department.

6.3. Metro Public Engagement Guide

In 2013, Metro updated its Public Engagement Guide,¹⁷ which governs the organization’s approach to public involvement, including an extensive outreach effort to solicit community input into how Metro conducts its engagement efforts. Although this publication is not binding on the City, the public comments received during this project provide some insight on public sentiments and expectations from a public involvement program.

6.4. American Institute of Certified Planners Code of Ethics

The American Institute of Certified Planners (AICP) Code of Ethics and Professional Conduct¹⁸ discusses public involvement in its principles regarding responsibility to the general public. Related principles include:

- We shall provide timely, adequate, clear, and accurate information on planning issues to all affected persons and to governmental decision makers.
- We shall give people the opportunity to have a meaningful impact on the development of plans and programs that may affect them. Participation should be broad enough to include those who lack formal organization or influence.

¹⁷ Metro Public Engagement Guide Final Adoption Draft, November 2013 (<http://www.oregonmetro.gov/public-engagement-guide>).

¹⁸ <https://www.planning.org/ethics/ethicscode.htm>

Although the AICP Code of Ethics is not binding on the City, a number of planners within the Planning Department and elsewhere in the City are AICP-certified and are required to follow this code of ethics.

6.5. City Strategic Communications and Marketing Group

The City Manager's Office includes Communications and Marketing group that manages the City's overall branding, communications strategies, outreach to the media and to the public, and the usage of technologies such as the City Web site and social media resources. The group is developing a citywide strategic communications and marketing plan that aims to address, among other topics, the means by which City departments communicate and engage with residents, and how those communications and events are planned, implemented, and evaluated. This plan is currently under development.

7. Emerging Issues, Challenges, and Trends

The City faces a number of issues and challenges to conducting a successful public participation program. This section examines these issues, and also explores some emerging trends and opportunities that the City could leverage to improve its overall public engagement work.

7.1. Issues & Challenges

7.1.1. Public involvement oversight structure

Despite its most recent restructuring, the current CIAC/ACCI arrangement continues to suffer from lack of full participation and lack of broad representation. The membership of both public involvement oversight boards consists mostly of members of other City planning-related boards and commissions. There is no geographic representation requirement of CIAC, and the geographic representation on ACCI consists of just one representative from each of the three council wards. Although the CIAC (by virtue of having the same membership as the Planning Commission) requires occupational diversity, the structures of ACCI and CIAC do not specifically address participation from youth, minorities, or underrepresented populations.

The current CIAC/ACCI structure is technically allowed under Goal 1, but may not withstand scrutiny from DLCD and the statewide CIAC upon plan amendment review as the ACCI has not provided the broad representation anticipated (and upon which the statewide CIAC conditioned its approval). The statewide CIAC has stated that a public involvement oversight board independent from other governing bodies is the preferred option for local governments.¹⁹ Moreover, the CIAC/ACCI structure is difficult to administer, and may not be the best approach for meeting stated public preferences (from Hillsboro 2020/2035) and City strategic goals. No periodic evaluation of overall public involvement or review of approved outreach plans has been implemented.

7.1.2. Departmental Public Involvement Plan

The Planning Department does not currently have a centralized, departmental Public Involvement Plan from which public involvement activities can be planned, implemented, and evaluated. Without such a plan in place, efforts to foster innovation and continual improvement are complicated, and it precludes evaluation, which is a key aspect of Goal 5 of the City's Strategic Plan.

¹⁹ *Putting the People in Planning: A Primer on Public Participation in Planning*, Third Edition (May 2008). Oregon Citizen Involvement Advisory Committee, Department of Land Conservation and Development.

A departmental Public Involvement Plan (informed by, but separate from, the Comprehensive Plan, Vision Action Plan, and City Strategic Plan) should address how the department approaches public involvement in a variety of scenarios, segments of the community, and types of projects. The Plan should also specify what sort of research and data-gathering should be conducted prior to beginning projects (such as demographic research, identification of key desired outcomes, and unique barriers/assets to participation), and should also specify how evaluation of individual projects is used to enhance future efforts.

7.1.3. Multilingual content

In Hillsboro, over 2,000 households (or 6.2% of the total households in the City) report some level of linguistic isolation.²⁰ This is higher than the rate for Washington County (4.9%) and the Portland Metropolitan Statistical Area (4.0%). Hillsboro residents that are linguistically isolated most commonly speak Spanish, Vietnamese, Chinese, and Korean.²¹ In fact, Hillsboro has nearly double the rate of linguistically isolated households speaking Spanish than the Portland MSA as a whole (4.2% in the City versus 2.0% in the region).

Currently, the Planning Department offers 2 of its 35 land use applications (Home Occupation and Mobile/Temporary Business) in Spanish. The department has not produced public notices or most meeting materials in Spanish. Counter assistance is available in Spanish when fluent employees (typically from the Building Department) are available. Web site information is available translated via Google Translate. Although the department offers translation services at public hearings, meetings, and events, staff could not recall a request for translation in the last decade. Other than the Web site, no materials are translated to languages other than Spanish.

The lack of materials available in Spanish or other languages may be a barrier to participation for certain community groups. Comments collected from the public in Hillsboro 2035 clearly indicate the community's desire to expand engagement within the Latino community; thus, the City may need to expand the amount of multilingual information that it makes available.

7.2. Emerging Trends & Opportunities

In addition to the challenges listed above, looking at emerging best practices and opportunities can help to identify areas to focus on when crafting goals and policies. Some examples are discussed below.

7.2.1. Collaborative Community Engagement

Some local governments are beginning to turn to a more collaborative approach to community engagement, particularly for projects that need to focus on outreach to historically underrepresented communities in order to be successful, or where the broadest possible involvement throughout a community is desired. In a collaborative arrangement, the City partners with existing organizations performing outreach to the target communities, providing subject-matter expertise, resources, and sometimes even funding to the partner organization, who then coordinates the outreach activities.

²⁰ American Community Survey, 2013 (Table B16002, 5-year estimate). NOTE: A "limited English speaking household" is defined in the ACS as one in which all members 14 years old and over have at least some difficulty with English.

²¹ American Community Survey, 2012 (Table 150001, 5-year estimate).

Locally, Washington County used this approach in the Aloha-Reedville Study and Livable Community Plan project completed in 2014. The project was structured to have an overall Citizen Advisory Committee consisting of representatives of local organizations and institutions, but also explicitly leaving space for additional members to be added later in the process as more participants expressed interest. The project also specifically involved organizations representing Spanish-speaking residents, and included outreach to faith-based organizations established in the area. In some cases, funding was provided to some partner organizations to support their efforts. As the County found,²² these sorts of engagements can improve engagement in underrepresented communities, although they can also significantly complicate project management, overhead, and costs.

7.2.2. Youth Engagement

There are over 6,500 high school students enrolled in the Hillsboro School District,²³ yet Planning Department outreach activities often overlook these members of the public. Through the Mayor's Youth Advisory Council, the City has a strong program encouraging youth involvement and civic engagement. Harnessing the participation of youth leaders on project-based and standing advisory committees, or even in governing bodies themselves, could lend an important and innovative perspective to existing public involvement efforts.

Some cities have included youth-specific events and materials in their public involvement for long-term planning projects, including working with local schools to engage students and their families about cities and land use planning. Other cities have expanded youth participation beyond project-based engagement and into the governing bodies themselves, in both voting and advisory capacities. Locally, the City of Tualatin allows (but does not require) appointment of a youth representative to the Planning Commission.

Finally, technology (discussed in section 7.2.3 and 7.2.4) plays a critical role in youth engagement: 95% of teens use the Internet; 47% use a smartphone; and 81% use social media to some extent. Many teens have a basic expectation that most information should be quickly and easily accessible online.²⁴ Thus, expanding the technical capacity of the department is critical to sustaining youth engagement.

7.2.3. Web and mobile technologies

Hillsboro, like most cities, maintains a planning Web site to provide access to meeting agendas, ordinances, application forms, maps, and other information. The Planning Department Web site is well-used, with both the Department's home page and codes and standards page in the City's top 30 Web destinations (by page views). The most popular department Web pages contain information on maps, regulations, zoning, applications, forms, and major projects. Content on the department Web site is typically static text, pictures, and diagrams. Feedback from Hillsboro 2020/2035 has indicated that the public desires enhanced access to Web resources for City services and the use of

²² Public Involvement Report, Aloha-Reedville Study and Community Plan (April 2014). Washington County Department of Land Use and Transportation.

²³ Facts and Figures, Hillsboro School District Public Data Portal (<http://www.hsd.k12.or.us/AboutHSD/PublicDataPortal/FactsandFigures.aspx>).

²⁴ Rainie, L. Pew Research Center (Internet, Science, and Tech) (2014). *13 Things to Know About Teens and Technology* (<http://www.pewinternet.org/2014/07/23/13-things-to-know-about-teens-and-technology/>).

technology as an engagement tool. Offering enhanced Web services is also consistent with City Strategic Plan actions addressing communication, community engagement, public information, and innovation.

Cities seeking to extend the capabilities of their sites have integrated more interactive tools such as games and discussion forums, online surveys, streaming video of meetings or other presentations, and more multilingual content. Cities have also been turning to existing technologies such as e-mail services to allow the public to receive notices and other information electronically.²⁵ In addition, placing more content on the Web allows for the use of automated translation services such as Google Translate, which while providing somewhat inconsistent or rudimentary translation at times, can still help to bridge linguistic gaps and allow more of the community access to planning information.

Mobile technologies present an exciting opportunity to expand awareness and engagement. Sixty-seven percent (67%) of Washington County respondents to a recent Metro survey²⁶ report owning a smartphone, slightly less than other counties in the region. Half of these people report that they would be somewhat or very likely to use a free mobile app that would facilitate engagement with the City. Washington County respondents also rated the ability to connect from home or through a mobile device as the most important way that Metro could improve engagement.

Typically, mobile technologies are oriented toward improving awareness (for example, using GPS to show information about resources or projects nearby) or engagement (for example, by allowing users to interact with the City on their phone). The existing Hillsboro Web infrastructure automatically converts most Web content to be more effectively displayed on smartphones and tablets. The Planning Department does not currently offer mobile-specific content, services, or downloadable applications.

7.2.4. Open Data and Civic Technology

Open data multiplies the effectiveness of the City's technology investment by enabling interested community members to use City public data to build new tools and applications that can address issues in the communities. These grassroots public-private partnerships with "civic technologists" can yield innovative and scalable solutions that the City is unlikely to be able to efficiently implement on its own. Data sets could include land use applications, natural resource inventory information, long-range plan data, or the like. For example, King County, Washington, has published a public data set of all 27,000+ planning applications that they have received, including the case file number and address.²⁷ The department could also publish some data that it is already collecting internally – population growth, demographics, and development history are just some examples. Applications also exist beyond the realm of land use and transportation to other City functions.

²⁵ Evans-Cowley, J., & Kitchen, J. (2011) Planning Advisory Service Report 565: *E-Government*, American Planning Association.

²⁶ Metro Opt In Public Engagement Survey, DHM Research, 2013.

²⁷ Dataset available at <http://www.civicdata.com/dataset/d1536163-66bf-4477-89ba-fbb78bd52fa3/resource/cc9fd7fd-2602-459d-805a-f259d9a9e18a>.

Similar efforts in Philadelphia have grown to regional approaches involving data from a variety of sources, including cities, transit districts, and service providers.²⁸

Even small steps toward open data are beneficial: the City, for example, does not provide a way to query currently pending land use applications. Providing additional transparency into planning decisions supports transparency and engagement directives from Goal 1, is consistent with transparency and innovation elements of the City Strategic Plan, and addresses Vision comments encouraging better use of technology.

8. Recommended Plan Updates and Policy Questions to Consider

Public involvement is poised to play a significant role in the implementation of a new Comprehensive Plan, taking the discussion of public involvement in the Plan beyond something that we have to do in order to comply with state law, and instead positioning it as something that we want to do in order to achieve our goals, measure our success, and improve our work in the future.

The key policy question to consider at this time is the structure of public involvement oversight. The existing ACCI/CIAC structure has not proven to be effective, but more complicated structures attempted in the past were too unwieldy. What should the role of the Planning Commission be in Public involvement oversight? How do we integrate and engage youth and underrepresented communities?

In addition to this key question, the following updates are recommended based on the issues outlined in this report:

1. Create a dedicated section just for Public involvement, relocating application and procedural issues to the Land Use Procedures section.
2. Ensure that policy language regarding Public involvement oversight addresses both the language in Statewide Planning Goal 1, as well as language from the statewide CIAC manual and previous direction given to the City at CIAC meetings. Give preference to an independent oversight body. (See related policy question in section 8.1.)
3. Create Goals and/or Policies that:
 - a. Foster a culture of civic engagement, public participation, and volunteerism by creating a Planning Department Public Involvement Program that actively involves all segments of the community in planning processes by analyzing issues, generating ideas, developing plans, monitoring outcomes, and reporting achievements.
 - b. Create outreach strategies to engage the Latino community and other ethnic communities that are growing in the City. Addresses providing multilingual content to the public, both in person and online.
 - c. Develop collaboration and engagement strategies that help us reach populations that typically aren't involved, working with existing community organizations, service providers, businesses, and faith communities.

²⁸ *Bright Spots in Community Engagement*. National League of Cities, April 2013.

- d. Employ innovative techniques and tools for communication and engagement, including Web, mobile, and social media technologies.
- e. Regularly publish planning-related statistics and data for public use.
- f. Create opportunities for youth engagement, including youth-focused initiatives and regular outreach to youth and the educational community during planning projects.
- g. Promote transparency and accountability by creating effective means of two-way communication between City government and the Hillsboro community, emphasizing how decisions are made, how people can provide input, and how that input is taken into account.
- h. Provide information in an accessible and easy to understand format.
- i. Utilize broadly representative public advisory bodies to provide input on Comprehensive Plan implementation, major planning initiatives, and other projects as appropriate.
- j. Provide adequate resources to support the City's land use related Public involvement program.

9. Resources

13 Things to Know About Teens and Technology, available at

<http://www.pewinternet.org/2014/07/23/13-things-to-know-about-teens-and-technology/>.

American Institute of Certified Planners Code of Ethics, available at

<https://www.planning.org/ethics/ethicscode.htm>

Bright Spots in Community Engagement. National League of Cities, available at <http://www.nlc.org/find-city-solutions/city-solutions-and-applied-research/governance-and-civic-engagement/democratic-governance-and-civic-engagement/bright-spots-in-community-engagement>

Metro Public Engagement Guide Final Adoption Draft, November 2013, available at

<http://www.oregonmetro.gov/public-engagement-guide>

Putting the People in Planning: A Primer on Public Participation in Planning, Third Edition (May 2008).

Oregon Citizen Involvement Advisory Committee, Department of Land Conservation and Development, available at http://www.oregon.gov/lcd/docs/publications/putting_the_people_in_planning.pdf

Review History

Date	Reviewed By
06.18.2015	Internal Committee – <i>Comments Incorporated</i>
09.30.2015	Advisory Committee for Citizen Involvement – <i>Comments Incorporated</i>
10.8.2015	Technical Advisory Committee – <i>Comments Incorporated</i> Note: Background report retitled to Public Involvement in subsequent drafts
10.22.2015	Citizen Advisory Committee – <i>Comments Incorporated</i>
12.9.2015	Planning Commission - <i>No changes</i>